UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,818	04/30/2001	Kristian Vaajala	944-003.031	2309

4955 7590 03/29/2004

WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS &
ADOLPHSON, LLP
BRADFORD GREEN BUILDING 5
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224
MONROE, CT 06468

EXAMINER	
GOLINKOFF, JORDAN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	7

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/845,818	VAAJALA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jordan S Golinkoff	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 April 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-62* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-62* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 April 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- Page 1-2, lines 29-9 – This paragraph is a run-on sentence and should be broken into more than one sentences to be grammatically correct.
- Page 5, line 4 – The description of figure 15 discusses menus. Figure 15 actually is displaying a hierarchy or a tree view. The description should be changed to more accurately indicate the content shown in figure 15.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-5, 7-9, 12-17, 19-23, 25-29, 31-37, 39-47, 49-53, 55-59, and 61-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hedberg (WO 99/32960 A1).

As per independent claim 1, Hedberg teaches a method for displaying graphical information on a display of an electronic device sized for hand-held use (page 5, lines 20-24), said display providing an image in a window having an extent limited by the size of the electronic device, comprising the steps of: receiving an input windowing signal actuated by a user of said electronic device (page 4, lines 3-9, *movement*), said windowing signal having a

magnitude indicative of a selected whole or portion of an extent of said graphical information greater than displayable at once as said image over said limited extent of said window (page 4, lines 3-9, *i.e. – different magnification or different parts*), and displaying said selected whole or portion of said extent of said graphical information on said limited extent window, in response to said user actuated input windowing signal (page 4, lines 10-21).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Hedberg teaches that the graphical information has a given resolution available over said extent of said graphical information and wherein said step of displaying said whole or portion of said extent of said graphical information is at a resolution less than or equal to said given resolution (page 6, lines 14-22, *the hand-held display device shows graphical information at a lower resolution than original graphical information*).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Hedberg teaches the steps of: receiving an input zoom signal actuated by said user of said electronic device, said input zoom signal having a magnitude indicative of a selected level of resolution, wherein said graphical information has a given resolution available over said extent of said graphical information greater than displayable at once in said window, and displaying said selected level of resolution over a portion of said extent of said graphical information (page 6-7, lines 33-6).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Hedberg teaches that the input windowing signal is provided in response to said user actuating a finger- or hand-actuated control device associated with said electronic device (page 6, lines 33-35).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, Hedberg teaches that the control device includes one or more finger-actuable buttons or keys (page 6, line 34).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 4, Hedberg teaches that the control devices includes one or more joysticks (page 1, lines 15-23).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Hedberg teaches that the input windowing signal is provided in response to said user moving said electronic device (page 4, lines 3-9).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 8, Hedberg teaches that said moving includes moving said device with changing velocity (page 4, lines 3-9, *a force accelerometer measures changing velocity*).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 2, Hedberg teaches that the input windowing signal is provided in response to said user moving said electronic device (page 4, lines 3-9).

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 12, Hedberg teaches that the moving includes moving said device with changing velocity (page 4, lines 3-9, *a force accelerometer measures changing velocity*).

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 3, Hedberg teaches that the input zoom signal is provided in response to said user moving said electronic device (pages 6-7, lines 33-6).

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 14, Hedberg teaches that the moving includes moving said device with changing velocity (page 4, lines 3-9, *a force accelerometer measures changing velocity*).

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 1, Hedberg teaches the step of displaying a stationary pointer on said limited extent window for use in selecting a link in its vicinity (page 7, lines 20-29).

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 16, Hedberg teaches the step of receiving a user entered link selection signal for said selecting a link (page 7, lines 20-29, *i.e. – "under" a fixed pointer*).

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 16, Hedberg teaches the that the step of displaying is carried out only when link is positioned in said vicinity of said stationary pointer (page 7, lines 20-29).

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 16, Hedberg teaches that the stationary pointer is positioned in a central position within said limited extent window (page 7, lines 20-29, and figure 6, element 15, *pointer is positioned in the center of the display*).

As per independent claim 21, Hedberg teaches a method for displaying graphical information on a limited extent display of a hand-holdable electronic device (page 5, lines 20-24), comprising the steps of: receiving inputs actuated by a user to indicate various selected levels of detail, wherein said graphical information has a level of detail over an extent greater than displayable at said level of detail over said limited extent display with a greatest level of detail available in said display (page 3, lines 27-31), and displaying said graphical information, in response to said inputs actuated by said user, in said various selected levels of detail over an increasingly lesser extent of said extent of said graphical information with increasingly greater levels of detail of said graphical information (page 6-7, lines 33-6, *i.e. – zooming in*).

Claims 22-23 are similar in scope to claims 4 and 5, respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 25-29 are similar in scope to claims 7, 8, 9, 16, and 17, respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 31-37 are similar in scope to claims 19, 20, 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 39-47 are similar in scope to claims 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17, respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 49-50 are similar in scope to claims 19 and 20, respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 51 is similar in scope to claim 21, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 52-53 are similar in scope to claims 4 and 5, respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 55-59 are similar in scope to claims 7, 8, 9, 16, and 17, respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 61-62 are similar in scope to claims 19 and 20, respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 8, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Flack et al. ("Flack," US006288704B1).

As per independent claim 1, Flack teaches a method for displaying graphical information on a display of an electronic device sized for hand-held use, said display providing an image in a window having an extent limited by the size of the electronic device, comprising the steps of: receiving an input windowing signal actuated by a user of said electronic device, said windowing signal having a magnitude indicative of a selected whole or portion of an extent of said graphical information (column 5, lines 32-37) greater than displayable at once as said image over said limited extent of said window (column 6, lines 8-17), and displaying said selected whole or portion of said extent of said graphical information on said limited extent window, in response to said user actuated input windowing signal (column 6, lines 8-17).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Flack teaches that the input windowing signal is provided in response to said user moving said electronic device (column 4, lines 14-20).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 8, Flack teaches that the moving includes moving with respect to sensible objects (column 4, lines 14-20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 6, 24, 38, and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hedberg (WO 99/32960 A1) and further in view of Will (US005825353A).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 4, the teachings of Hedberg in regards to claim 4 have been discussed above. Hedberg does not disclose that the control device includes one or more finger-actuable rollers.

Will teaches that the control device includes one or more finger-actuable rollers (column 2, lines 52-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hedberg to include a finger-actuable roller device to provide input, as taught by Will, with the motivation to allow a simple and effective control of small personal digital devices (column 2, lines 35-43).

Claims 24, 38, and 54 are similar in scope to claim 6, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

8. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hedberg (WO 99/32960 A1) and further in view of Sypniewski (US006054951A).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 8, the teachings of Hedberg in regards to claim 8 have been discussed above. Hedberg does not disclose that the moving includes moving said device with respect to a magnetic field.

Sypniewski teaches that the moving includes moving said device with respect to a magnetic field (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hedberg with a means to detect movement of a hand-held device with respect to a magnetic field, as taught by Sypniewski, with

the motivation to more quickly determine the location and movement of a device (column 2, lines 42-43).

9. Claims 18, 30, 48, and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hedberg (WO 99/32960 A1).

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 16, the teachings of Hedberg in regards to claim 16 have been discussed above. Hedberg does not explicitly disclose the step of changing a color or shape of said stationary pointer when in said vicinity of said link. Official Notice is given that changing the color or shape of a pointer when in the vicinity of a link is notoriously well-known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hedberg with a means to change the color or shape of a pointer when in the vicinity of a link with the motivation to indicate to the user when it is possible to select and activate the link.

Claims 30, 48, and 60 are similar in scope to claim 18, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Numata et al. (JP 2000284884 A) teach a method to browse the internet on a portable personal device using joystick.

Assignee Lang H (DE 20105214 U1) teaches a method to use movement with respect to a magnetic field to control a cursor.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jordan S Golinkoff whose telephone number is 703-305-8771. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jordan Golinkoff
Patent Examiner
March 4, 2004

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100